PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

303. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of Lafayette, Ind., favoring legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

304. By the SPEAKER: Petition of president, Oil Heat Institute of Long Island, Inc., Long Island, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favoring decontrol of natural gas at the wellhead to permit a full and free competition among the various home-heating fuels, thus protecting the rights of the consumer, without unduly favoring any one fuel over the others; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Idaho Power Co. Fast Tax Writeoff—Chronology of Actions Taken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, at the time the bill to authorize a high dam at Hells Canyon was under consideration, I suggested that it would be in the public interest, and certainly would be useful in the consideration of the matter, if the President directed the departments and the various agencies of the Government which had to do with the rapid tax writeoff benefit to the Idaho Power Co. to prepare a chronology of the events in connection with that action, along the same line as the chronology prepared in connection with the Dixon-Yates matter.

When he was asked about the suggestion at a press conference, the President stated that no request had been made directly to him for such a chronology.

On July 3, 1957, I wrote a letter to the President, suggesting that such a chronology would be helpful. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I note from a transcript of your press conference of today that in answer to a question from Mr. Robert Spivack, of the New York Post, as to whether you would ask all departments and agencies to get up a chronology of actions taken in regard to the Idaho Power Co. fast tax writeoff, you had this to say:

"I don't know. Senator KEFAUVER hasn't asked me. If he has said any such thing, he has said it for public consumption, and not to get any action, because he has not made any such request of me."

I made the statement on the floor of the United States Senate and it appears on page 9947 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 21, 1957.

Frankly, Mr. President, I had thought that an official statement on the floor of the Senate, carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was an official suggestion, and required no further direct communication with you. The only other time that I have had direct communication with you about such a topic was following your press conference on June 29, 1955, when in answer to a question about the role of Adolph Wenzell in the Dixon-Yates deal you said he was never called in or asked a single thing about the Dixon-Yates contract and that as quickly as the Dixon-Yates matter came up Mr. Wenzell resigned. I did feel constrained at that time to write you and inform you personally of the role played by Mr. Wenzell throughout the negotiations, a position similar to that which the Justice Department is now taking in defending the Government against the suit filed by Dixon-Yates.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding in this case, I do indeed think it would be a public service for you to order an official chronology, from all bureaus, agencies, and departments, in the Idaho Power tax writeoff, giving all conferences, all personnel attending the conferences, and making public all papers having to do with this deal.

As in the Dixon-Yates case, we have been met with the plea of privilege concerning the participation of White House staff members who were named in one of the documents we saw. Governor Pyle refused our invitation to appear before the committee. We have been met with the plea of privilege concerning memorandums. We learned about the position of Interior Secretary Seaton in opposing the writeoff only after we had originally been led by the testimony of Mr. Gordon Gray to believe that the Interior Department approved it.

As in the Dixon-Yates deal, we feel that we are not getting the full facts, and that perhaps you, too, have not been given the full facts. It was for these reasons that I made the statement that I did on the floor.

Looking forward to your cooperation, I am,

Yours sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senator.

House Postmaster Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to bring to the attention of the Members that the Postmaster of the House of Representatives, Mr. H. H. Morris, was recently honored with the presentation by his fellow employees of a silver plaque commemorating his 25 years of service as an employee of the House of Representatives.

Although "H," as he is known by his many friends here on the Hill, hails from Henry County, New Castle, Ky., and is therefore technically a constituent of mine, I would not be presenting a true picture of the situation if I did not add that "H" is a real "constituent" of every Member. I say this because in his 25 years on the Hill "H" has won many friends on both sides of the aisle and has rendered faithful and competent service in the best tradition of an employee of the House of Representatives.

"H" came to the House in 1932 as an employee of the late Virgil Chapman—then a Representative from the Sixth District of Kentucky. In 1952, it was to my benefit and pleasure to have him serve as my secretary until he was elected to his present position as House Postmaster.

I consider it a real privilege to commend him at this time for his achievement and excellent service.

Eighty-fifth Anniversary of Popular Science Monthly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a magazine dedicated to informing the American public on scientific advancement is this year celebrating its 85th anniversary. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I have issued in connection with the work of the magazine, Popular Science monthly.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America is recognized and admired throughout the world for its technological leadership. This enviable situation has been brought about not only because of our outstanding scientists, teachers and technical schools, but also because of the hunger for knowledge of the American people.

This interest in technological matters, which is a main source of our industrial strength, is nurtured and encouraged by many springs of knowledge including the government, our fine schools and some outstanding American publications.

One of these publications, Popular Science monthly, celebrated its 85th anniversary in May of this year, and as a long-time reader and occasional contributor to Popular Science, I should like to call attention briefly to its role in reporting and interpreting science and mechanical advances for these many years. As an example of its treatment of important problems, the magazine has started an educational guidance series of articles on how gifted children should be prepared for college, how average students may be aided, how to help children who will not go to college and many other subjects which will be of great aid both to parents and educators. This series is aimed at building a better relationship between parents and educators.

But in addition to analyzing such current problems, Popular Science has also been alert to the advances of science, and the

magazine first reported such developments as telegraphic printing in 1872, the telephone in 1876, and the automobile in 1893.

This record of keeping the American people apprised of the progress of science reached a new level when Popular Science editors built a model of an artificial earth satellite.

The first model was placed on permanent exhibition in the halls of the Hayden Planetarium in New York City, a second model was presented to the United States Committee for the International Geophysical Year, and other models were loaned to the Chicago Museum of Science and Industry, the Buhl Planetarium in Pittsburgh and other similar institutions.

One model became a part of the American Dream Pageant, an exhibition of Americana that toured leading department stores throughout the country, where it was seen and studied by thousands.

This spirit of journalistic pioneering, scientific leadership and public service responsibility has helped to advance an understanding of the Nation's progress.

Military Construction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the vote on final passage of the military construction bill is scheduled for Wednesday, July 10. Prior to that vote, action will have to be taken on the Arends amendment which proposes to strike out section 411. I want to reemphasize my conviction that the Arends amendment should be defeated and that section 411 should be retained.

This section is essential for retaining the congressional authority which is ours. If the Arends amendment is adopted, the effect will be not only to delegate congressional authority to the administration, but it will make administrative action final and will constitute blanket approval of administrative judgment before the decisions are made.

Some of the discussions of this matter have been confusing and have erroneously contended that section 411 affects the fundamental philosophy concerning the participation of Government in business-type activities. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the general objective of eliminating governmental business activities which compete with private enterprise. Section 411 is in complete consonance with that general objective because it is not concerned with philosophy, it is merely concerned with the exercise of judgment.

I believe section 411 is highly desirable and that it will preserve for the Congress the right to check on the judgment of administrative officials. This section in no way reflects upon any official. The Congress has heretofore authorized, in most cases on an individual line-item basis, all of the business-type activities conducted by the military departments. We have appropriated the funds to finance the construction of buildings occupied by these activities, to purchase the equipment and to pay the employees. Defense Department officials have justified these authorizations and these appropriations year after year with arguments supporting their continuance. It has always been our responsibility to approve the establishment and financing of these functions, and to be consistent we must retain the right to require that those which should be conducted in the public interest are continued. We have in the past, and we should in the future, refused to give the military departments blanket authority to establish business-type activities without approval by the Congress. Neither should we give them blanket authority to discontinue such activities and to dissipate the assets involved without at least retaining an opportunity for Congressional review.

I hope the Members of the House will join me in resounding defeat of the Arends amendment.

Government Bookkeeping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial and two letters which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 5, 1957, in connection with S. 434, which I introduced, with 48 other Senators as cosponsors, and which recently passed the Senate unanimously, and is now under consideration in the House.

There being no objection, the editorial and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILL IN THE BLACK

The fiscal year for the Federal Government has ended, as expected, with the Treasury about $1 billion in the black. This is less than the President had forecast but about what the Joint Economic Committee of Congress predicted on the basis of more recent figures. The surplus, considering the size of the annual budget and of the debt, is hardly anything to write home about. But it does mark the first time in a quarter of a century that there have been two black-ink years in a row, and for this there will be general applause.

The outlook for fiscal 1958 is not at all clear. Prices continue to rise, and there are enough carryover appropriations on the books to allow deficit spending in this new fiscal year despite the cuts in new appropriations made by this Congress. It is anxiety over this prospect, of course, that lies at the root of the well-intentioned efforts of Senator KENNEDY and a number of his colleagues to put all appropriations on a year-by-year basis.

The Senator explains the proposal in a letter published elsewhere on this page today. We agree and have said that Congress ought to consider more carefully the long-range effects of appropriations that extend over more than 1 year. We certainly believe deficit spending is unjustified in the present circumstances. But we continue to have serious fears that important defense and other programs might be unduly hobbled by the kind of checkrein which Senator KENNEDY proposes. It would, in any case, be no guaranty of balanced budgeting. The pressure for tax cuts is so great that any sizable anticipated surplus will be quickly eliminated by a tax reduction, and a small budget surplus can become a deficit very readily if revenue estimates prove wrong.

CHANGING THE GOVERNMENT'S BOOKKEEPING

Your opposition in an editorial, A Dubious Reform, of June 26, to my bill for putting Government spending on an annual accrued expenditure basis is very surprising. The measure has received the almost unanimous support of the Senate, the House Committee on Government Operations, and top financial officials in the administration.

The measure was conceived by the Hoover Commission as its key proposal for restoring to Congress some of the control over the purse strings which has slipped away from its hands over the years.

The task force of the Hoover Commission, headed by J. Harold Stewart, of Boston, was composed of first-rank authorities on Government financial operations. They asserted that millions of dollars could be saved every year by requiring Congress to make appropriations each year on long-term projects, instead of appropriating the money all at once.

The fact is that under the present system these long-term projects are not adequately reviewed each year, and we currently have a carryover of $70 billion of unexpended appropriations—a sum almost as large as the entire budget for the coming year.

Fifty Senators, including the very economy-minded Senator BYRD, cosponsored the bill with me. It passed the Senate unanimously and has now been reported out unanimously by the House Government Operations Committee.

The only opposition in the Senate committee hearings came from representatives of the Department of Defense who raised technical objections about its administrative implementation by the Bureau of the Budget.

Your editorial stated that, under the annual accrued-expenditure method of stating appropriations requests, the departments would be obligated to pad their requests as a hedge against uncertainties. Since the contemplated projects would be contracted for at a fixed cost, the only uncertainty would be if deliveries on such items as defense equipment were made ahead of schedule so that a year's purchasing were completed in, say, 10 months.

In fact, the difficulty is almost always the other way—that deliveries are delayed. Moreover, padding the request would be futile since unexpended funds will automatically lapse at the end of the fiscal year.

Concomitantly, you state that funds might be recklessly spent to avoid the loss. This fails to take into consideration that, in the granting of an appropriation on the new basis, the agency must justify its request by revealing past costs and accomplishments.

Any reckless spending of an agency would be reflected in increased costs—a fact that would systematically and clearly come to the attention of Congress under this new system. And this is perhaps the central point—the agency would be required each year to justify what it has already spent and what it intends to spend on a long-term project.

The Congress' concern is not only to the long-range spending plans of the Government, but also with the year-by-year rate of spending. It is the latter which determines whether our budget is balanced or whether we have a surplus or deficit.

Everyone is looking for a way to streamline the Government functions to get rid of what Dostoevsky called "administrative

ecstasy." This is a measure which the financial experts agree will do this.

JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Senator from Massachusetts.

WASHINGTON.

The proposal embodied in S. 434, which Senator Kennedy and I introduced with 48 other Senators as cosponsors, is a logical follow-up of the vastly improved Federal budget and accounting procedures authorized by P. L. 863.

The basic theme of the editorial opposing S. 434 seems to be that if Congress were to only appropriate funds to be expended in a given year, it would result in needless red tape and confusion by requiring an annual review of long-lead-time programs which under the present system are for the most part considered only once.

As a matter of fact, appropriations for the civil functions of the Army Corps of Engineers, many of which are long-lead time projects, have been on a basis very similar to annual accrued expenditures for several years and the system of appropriating only those funds to be expended in the succeeding fiscal year has worked satisfactorily to all concerned.

Strict control should be maintained at all times over the expenditure of public funds. This was recognized by the Founding Fathers who wrote a provision into the Constitution that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

Yet the practice of appropriating funds in 1 year for expenditure as much as 10 years in the future has deprived both the executive and the Congress of any really effective control over the level of expenditure in a given fiscal year.

This year the accrued expenditure method of stating budget requests and appropriations has met with a more favorable reception in the House of Representatives and was recently favorably reported by the House Committee on Government Operations.

That committee added a provision to limit the authority contained in the bill to a 4-year period. In short, a trial period is proposed. If the proposal is as good as all of the experts firmly believe, it will amply demonstrate its value during this period.

FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
Senator from Maine.

WASHINGTON.

Decisions Emanating From the Board of Veterans' Appeals Make It Necessary That Legislation Be Enacted Clearly Defining Presumptive Periods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, there are pending before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs two bills in which I am very much interested. I refer to H. R. 420 which provides for a presumptive period of 2 years for malignant tumors, and H. R. 924 which provides for a 3-year period.

Presumptive periods are well established in Veterans' Administration law. For example, World War I veterans had until January 1, 1925, to show that a tuberculosis or neuropsychiatric condition was service connected. The medical officials frown upon presumptive periods and I, as a general rule, do not favor them either. However, some of the decisions which are emanating from the Board of Veterans' Appeals make it necessary that some legislation along this line be enacted.

To deny that rigorous basic training in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or the Air Force could aggravate a cancerous tumor is to adopt a position which is ridiculous in the extreme. If decisions of this sort prevail, they will only result in the rankest sort of injustice to all veterans who have the misfortune to suffer from such condition.

I, for one, am willing to go ahead on such legislation and hope that the chairman of the full committee will shortly see fit to schedule action on these bills.

Independence Day Address by Hon. Frank Church, of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on the 4th of July, at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, the people of eastern Pennsylvania had the opportunity to hear a most stimulating, eloquent, and thought-provoking address by the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR FRANK CHURCH DELIVERED AT INDEPENDENCE HALL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., ON JULY 4, 1957

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow citizens, I am highly honored to be your speaker today. My home is in the distant West—the youngest part of our country. What a singular satisfaction it is for me to come to Independence Hall in Philadelphia, the birthplace of our country, and here take part in this observance of Independence Day.

Those of us fortunate enough to be here are privileged to commemorate this 4th of July at the shrine of American liberty. Yet, even as we gather here, a thousand bands are playing and veterans are marching, and countless flags are waving in every part of the land. Flashing fireworks will fill our skies tonight, and Americans will congregate in parks and public squares to give evidence of their loyalty to our great Republic. And many will speak of patriotism.

Patriotism is love of country. How should one love his country? One should love his country as he loves his own child—with a will to serve its inmost needs; to see it reach fulfillment; to dream its best dreams, to labor to make them come true.

As a child grows from infancy to maturity, so does a country. As a child's needs change with the passing years, so do those of a country, with the changing times. The true patriot, like the best parent, seeks to know his country's real needs and to learn how to serve them wisely and well.

In 1776 our utmost need was to secure liberty. George III of England had persistently refused to grant to the English colonists in the new world the rights of Englishmen in the old, hard-won from the days of the Magna Carta. Steadily the rule of the royal governors had grown more insufferable. Again and again the colonists had petitioned their king, but their grievances were ignored, and their entreaties rebuked.

So the day came when no recourse remained but to renounce the Crown. Men of high station, with their lives and fortunes to lose, assembled in this historic hall, to pen their names to a ringing Declaration of Independence, proclaiming to the world that the Colonies had severed the political bands that connected them with England, and had assumed the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them.

Every man who placed his signature upon our Declaration of Independence, on that Fourth of July in 1776, from Thomas Jefferson to John Hancock, writing largely so that the King himself might plainly see, knew full well the peril that now confronted them. It is said that Benjamin Franklin remarked, before signing his name, "We must, indeed, all hang together, or, most assuredly, we shall all hang separately."

The Revolutionary War was hardly a contest between equals. The Colonies were rural, lying out on the fringes of the world, and ill-equipped to wage war against a rich and powerful monarch. But the rebels fought for liberty, a cause that fired the hearts of men who would be free, and American patriots, with gallant determination, battled the Redcoats, from the woods of Lexington and Concord to the breastworks at Bunker Hill—through the wintry agonies at Valley Forge to the final victory at Yorktown.

Yes; in 1776, our utmost need was to secure liberty. By the Declaration of Independence we solemnly announced our purpose; by the waging of a Revolutionary War we painfully achieved our goal.

Today, nearly two centuries later, our utmost need is to preserve liberty. Again we should solemnly declare our purpose to the world. But the method we must now pursue to achieve our goal can no longer be the waging of war. It must be the waging of peace.

Let us see why this is so.

The age we live in is as different from the age of colonial America as a powder horn is different from a hydrogen bomb. War is no longer an instrument by which men can win a worthy goal. A thermonuclear war could utterly destroy its participants, leaving nothing but chaos, ruin, and anarchy in its wake. Liberty depends on life and order. Both can be consumed by the witchfire of atomic war, and liberty lost even to those who yearn to preserve it.

I pray that we shall continue to deter the coming of another global war. But if we must do so by living indefinitely in a state of expectant war; by remaining forever teetering on the brink; by carrying an ever-heavier shield above us, then we must awaken to the fact that our liberty itself is in danger of being stifled in the very cause of defending it.

The debt of past war, and the current costs of military defense, now account for two-thirds of the total expenditures of the Federal Government. Today's bomber costs us 20 times as much as yesterday's Flying Fortress. Tomorrow's weapons will dwarf the cost of those we buy today. If we must continue our present course indefinitely, it will matter not what party controls the national administra-

tion. Government will get bigger and taxes will grow larger. From this there is no escape.

As the threat of war becomes ever more important in the formulation of national policy and national budget, the Central Government must continue to expand its powers. The prerogatives of States and communities will further wither. Most importantly, the rights of free men will give way to the interests of a national security that will always elude the mounting frenzy with which we shall pursue it. Thus the foundations of liberty will be eroded, for if we must endlessly prepare for total war, we must be prepared, ultimately, for total government.

So I submit that our country's foremost need today, if liberty is to be preserved for the future, is the need to conquer war in the world at large. That can be accomplished only by waging peace with the same zeal and determination with which we have waged war.

The peace of which I speak is not the cold war in which we now live. Peace is something different than absence from war. An armed truce is not peace, although 20 years continued. A cold war, unless abated, can only end in a hot war.

The time has come to plan a grand strategy for peace; to commit ourselves to its battles, its Lexingtons and Concords; to be prepared to suffer its Valley Forge; and to pursue our goal with strong and abiding faith that we shall at last achieve a Yorktown victory over war itself.

Our forefathers, here at Independence Hall, appealed to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of their intentions, and solemnly published and declared their purposes, and in support of them pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

We could do no better.

In a new declaration of independence from war itself, we might list, as did Thomas Jefferson and his colleagues, the failures of the old order, but we must, as they did also, proclaim new objectives that will capture the minds and hearts of men.

Let us declare it to be our high purpose to recognize and promote the cause of colonial peoples who aspire, as we once aspired, to independence and self-government. Their force is crumpling empires. It is the inexorable force of our times. How greatly would be strengthen our moral leadership among free nations if we would honor and befriend the cause of colonial people. It is in our finest tradition that we do this. And such a course offers us our best hope for wresting them from imminent fall to the false and covetous lure of communism, and enlisting them to the cause of liberty and peace.

Let us declare our fixed and unremitting resolve to free the world from the threat of the silent dust of thermonuclear explosion, which could come to fill the air and settle impersonally upon the just and the unjust, and generations yet unborn. Let us lift the monstrous burden of armaments from the backs of men. We must find a way, lead the way, to enforceable disarmament so that tensions may be eased, unreasoning fears dissipated, and the energies of nations turned to the ending of want, hunger, and poverty.

Not least, let us move to the fore to improve and strengthen the United Nations, to make it more effective in its role as keeper of the peace, so that law may replace brute force in the solution of disputes among nations.

In 1776, the governmental principles stated here at Independence Hall were regarded as radical, mischievous, and foredoomed. Instead, they thrived and our Republic became an inspiration for all men who aspired to be free. In the years since, the clean structure of our liberty, like the form and shape of the liberty bell, has always been treasured in the spirit of the free.

If, in the days of our infancy, we could ignite a flame of freedom so bright as to shine like a beacon around the world, then now, in the days of our greatness, we must do no less.

Now is the time for us to recapture the spirit of our Revolution. Now is the time for us to be willing to venture and to dare, to espouse new methods—for the old have failed. Now is the time for bold and imaginative action—for proposals big enough to match and master the looming challenges of the atomic age.

Then let us hew the track for all men of high purpose and good will to follow—to the end that one day they might live in a world where freedom presides and peace endures.

Natural-Gas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JARMAN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee favorably reported H. R. 6790. This is a compromise bill designed to eliminate some of the confusion and uncertainty now facing the natural-gas-producing industry, which is not only one of Oklahoma's greatest industries but one of vital importance to the whole Nation. Those of us who in the past have advocated natural-gas legislation and now support this bill have been forced to compromise in an effort to obtain some legislative relief for the independent producer now faced with regulation which threatens to stifle the incentive to explore and develop this resource. Congressional attempts to enact a more desirable law by completely removing the producer from these onerous and unneeded controls have been thwarted twice by Presidential veto and once by Supreme Court interpretation in the Phillips decision of 1954. H. R. 6790 is legislation actually providing for Federal control of certain producers' contracts.

It should be made clear in the beginning that it is still our belief that Federal control and price-fixing at the producing level of this or any other industry is contrary to the fundamental principles of our Constitution, contrary to the intent of past legislation, and contrary to the interests of our people and country as a whole. It is our belief that Federal control of this industry can only result in fewer natural-gas reserves, less gas for nonproducing States, and an eventual increase in cost to the consumer. Further, it is still our belief that natural gas is a commodity and its production has none of the characteristics of a utility service. Natural-gas producers are now under regulation by the Federal Power Commission. The Natural Gas Act of 1938 was designed to apply to the utility service aspects of the interstate movement of natural gas and not to the commodity itself, and, we believe that its present application is in error.

H. R. 6790 falls far short of this position, but as shown by testimony by industry spokesmen, administration officials, and Federal Power Commission representatives, the public utility formula of control is absolutely unworkable for this industry, which bears no resemblance to a utility. Something must be done to ameliorate the present confused situation. This bill tends to clarify the producers' status and to delimit the areas subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission and eliminates many of the undesirable features of the present formula of control.

While not all we would ask for in natural-gas legislation, it is a bill which, if enacted into law, would tend to encourage the independent producer to explore, drill, and develop sufficient gas reserves to supply fuel to all States of the Union at reasonable prices. It is our belief that this Congress with the interests of the industry and consumers in mind must provide this encouragement.

Washington Report by Congressman Bruce Alger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following July 6 newsletter to my constituents:

WASHINGTON REPORT, BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

A roundup of odds and ends seems appropriate for a light legislative week accompanying July 4. First, should Congress be televised? Yes, though its debatable. The pitiless eye of the kinescope and John and Jane Doe at home could straighten out some of our problems. True, grandstanding would be possible—and important unpublicized work by committees might be overlooked. But our government is based on informed public opinion. I'm for citizens knowing what's going on. That's why my extra effort in newsletters, questionnaires, radio, and television. (The 1957 questionnaires are pouring in. It is my hope that every recipient will express himself. The difficulty of "yes" and "no" answers is the same faced by a Congressman in his voting.)

Taxpayers should know how Congress appropriates (spends) their money. It's quite a system. For example, we have passed the conference report of the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bills for 1958 after the conferees of the House and Senate adjusted the differences between their respective bills. Let's examine the system, taking a specific item; for example, the salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Employment Security, one of the Labor Departments' many bureaus. Here's how it started:

Item: salaries, expenses, appropriated 1957, $5,558,000; budget estimate 1958, $6,358,000; recommended 1958, $6 million.

Bill compared with: Appropriated 1957, +$442,000; estimated 1958, —$358,000.

Let's review the steps. The House committee studied and held hearings on the budget estimate for $6,358,000, $800,000 more than 1957's appropriation. Responsibly, with "cut the budget" cries from constituents, the committee recommended to the House a total of $6 million, $358,000 below

the budget request, but still $442,000 above last year. The House then voted to cut this further to $5,558,000, the same amount as last year. Then the House bill went to the Senate. The Senate committee, too, started with the budget request of $6,358,000 and cut this to $6 million, which the Senate approved. Then the conference of several Senate and House representatives, the conferees, debated and compromised the $5,558,000 House figure and $6 million Senate figure at $5,958,000, which both House and Senate approved.

Now, note the results: 1. More money was appropriated than last year ($400,000) but everyone is on record for economy (both Senators and Representatives cut the figure with which they started). 2. Every Member when necessary can proclaim support for the Government program, but can equally proclaim he's for economy and cutting the budget. 3. The Senate usually adds money and shows less fiscal responsibility than the House. 4. Politicians can demagog and straddle the fence. 5. Politicians are this way because they can't or won't say "No" to constituents' demands for more and more Federal aid. 6. The situation won't change unless people change, both constituents and Congressmen. Such is the appropriation story.

Typical inconsistencies from constituents: 1. Economize, cut the budget, but not my project, pension, or special interest. 2. Get me a tax cut, but give me all (and more) the Government service that I've had in the past.

Floorwork inconsistencies include: 1. Government with a "heart" means a Federal solution with taxpayers' money for every problem—housing, food, employment, wages, financial security, floods, droughts, polio and sickness, charity, relief, countless business operations, etc.—Government has the money and the power, besides it's smart politics, it means votes. 2. A do-something versus do-nothing Congress is measured by the number of new laws passed (every law subtracts a measure of individual freedom)—we can correct anything with another resolution. 3. Everyone's for States rights in principle but not in practice. 4. A nameless vacuum exists into which either Federal or State Government must move—if the State won't, the Federal must (X amendment?). 5. To some in voting it's, "What's politically the right move?" or "My party, right or wrong, but my party." 6. This is just a temporary or emergency measure (this always just precedes its permanent adoption). 7. It may be a bad program, but we must spend this much more to protect what we've already spent. 8. You can't buy friendship, but let's keep trying (foreign aid). 9. Elimination of waste and duplication in government is good (Hoover Commission bills) but * * *? (No political sex appeal; bills are shelved.) One thing I know, the people of Dallas County will be told what's going on in their Government so far as I have the ability and strength. Can we expose and eliminate some of the inconsistencies? It's worth while, isn't it?

Reducing the Nation's Staggering Crime Toll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the morning newspapers report continuing leads developed by police authorities in investigating the underworld connections between gambling czar Frank Costello and various criminal sources, as well as "legitimate" enterprises.

We are reminded, as well, by the current investigation of racketeering being so ably conducted by the McClellan committee that there is a vast amount of illegal activity going on in this country which tarnishes our good name in the eyes of the world, and in the eyes of self-respecting people here at home.

Obviously, infinitely more must be done to clean up the conditions of crime in this country.

Last month, at a meeting of the Washington Criminal Justice Association, it was estimated that serious crime in our land is diverting no less than $28 billion a year from the national economy, and is infiltrating a wide degree of activities of civic and community life.

This was the estimate made by Mr. Aaron Kohn, president of the National Association of Citizens Crime Commissions.

As a former member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, I have, on many occasions, pointed out the invaluable role played by civic watchdogs like the Citizens Crime Commissions, the Washington Criminal Justice Association, and similiar groups across the Nation.

I ask my colleagues to think what an enormous amuont of tax revenue the Federal Government must be losing because of underworld evasion of its fair share of taxes.

I ask my colleagues to think how this country could use more profitably the $28 billion which is being diverted into the costs of crime in our midst.

I ask my colleagues to think of the implications of underworld infiltration of legitimate business.

Right now, for example, several of the States are reportedly investigating the extent to which one or more State-chartered insurance companies may have granted loans of a very dubious quality to gambling establishments, perhaps at the request of underworld figures.

I hope, therefore, that the States and the localities will recognize their responsibility to proceed full-speed ahead on investigations to clean up their own areas.

The Federal Government can and must fulfill its responsibilities, but it cannot and it must not usurp the basic responsibilities of the States and cities.

Here in Congress, however, I earnestly hope that the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce will find it possible to review the anticrime bills which we, of the Senate Crime Committee, recommended to it way back in 1950 and 1951.

In the meanwhile, I wish continued success to the McClellan committee in its own vigorous pursuit of those who use violence in labor or industry to coerce American citizens.

I ask unanimous consent that an article which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 14, 1957, describing the $28 billion crime cost to our country, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION'S CRIME TAB SET AT $28 BILLION

Serious crime is diverting $28 billion a year from the national economy and is infiltrating civic and community life, Aaron Kohn, president of the National Associations of Citizens Crime Commission, told the Washington Criminal Justice Association yesterday.

Kohn spoke as the WCJA honored its outgoing president, Ralph D. Pittman, in its 21st annual luncheon meeting at the Ambassador Hotel.

Director of the New Oreleans Crime Commission and a former FBI agent, Kohn said there is an intense need for arousing public interest in citizens' crime commissions as a means of forming a united front for a war on the Nation's spiraling crime rate.

H. Holmes Vogel, vice president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., and new president of the Criminal Justice Association, called on John Remon, a WCJA past president, to present a plaque to Pittman at the luncheon.

The plaque expressed "deep appreciation" for Pittman's "splendid and unselfish performance of duty" during his 3 years as WCJA president.

"Your participation and accomplishments for the Washington Criminal Justice Association have resulted in an improved administration of criminal justice and better law enforcement for the District," the inscription said in part.

The Boy Scout Jamboree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a youthful army in forest green shorts and multicolored neckerchiefs took over the Capitol yesterday and I for one was thrilled by its occupation.

The uniformed "invaders" were some of the 60,000 Boy Scouts from every State in the Union, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and many foreign lands, who for the next 10 days will be camping in a city of 25,000 tents on the rolling hills of historic Valley Forge for the 1957 Boy Scout Jamboree. Many of these jamboree Scouts stopped off at this Capital City for a brief glimpse of their Government in action en route to the Valley Forge campsite while still others will be visiting us on their homeward journey.

I am told that the Scouts will be consuming some 509,000 eggs and more than 599,000 quarts of milk during the jamboree, and the 3,000 acre tent city that will house them, for the time of its occupation will be the 16th largest city in the Keystone State. I know that one of the major jamboree activities will be the swapping that goes on wherever Boy Scouts get together. There will be swapping of neckerchief slides, camporee badges, ceremonial gear and industrial samples from their respective areas, but even more important than this exchange of tangibles will be the swapping of ideas

and friendships, the swapping of folkways and colloquialisms of speech. And out of all this the development of deep and lasting understanding and acceptance of the many differences that blend and merge into the harmonious pattern of our American way of life.

I recall so well my visit to the 1950 jamboree at Valley Forge when my own son was one of that great army of American boyhood encamped on the sun-warmed hillsides. I heard the rollicking Scout songs echo from rise to rise and thought how those old hills must have rocked to the strains of Yankee Doodle and Let Tyrants Shake Their Iron Rod, as the ragged Revolutionary soldiers sang to forget the misery, the hunger, and the cold.

I remember that thrilling pageant in the huge amphitheater, where the Scouts heard an address by the President of the United States and another by the top military leader of the day, the man who now sits behind the President's desk in the White House. There was a never-to-be-forgotten climax to that 1950 jamboree program when every light on the vast field was extinguished and a blanket of soft darkness fell over the buzzing, wriggling body of boys, bringing down a hush that seemed somehow sacred. Then in a far corner of the field one Scout lighted a tiny candle, its yellow flame leaping up and cutting through the enveloping blackness. One after another the boys lighted their candles until the whole amphitheater was shining with light, a moving demonstration of the power of a single candle to pierce the dark.

I like to think of those boys out there, swapping experiences and inspirations on the green hills of Valley Forge, as the shining candles of hope in this dark and weary world. May the ideals of Scouting burn brightly through all their lives and may these days at Valley Forge help them to appreciate and cherish the precious heritage that has been placed in their young and eager hands.

United States Policy on H-Bomb Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 1957, I addressed a letter to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles concerning H-bomb tests and the dangers of nuclear fallout. I have now received an official reply from the State Department which I believe is most interesting since it outlines American policy and thinking on this matter at the present time.

Briefly, I had proposed in my letter that the United States should issue a declaration to the world stating that this country will make no H-bomb tests for a period of 6 months regardless of what other countries do. In this declaration the United States is to state clearly that we are taking this action in the interests of safeguarding humanity and civilization against the mortal perils of nuclear fallout.

Furthermore, I proposed that the declaration is to call on Soviet Russia and Great Britain to follow our example in accepting "this brief moratorium or trial period for the suspension of nuclear tests," and that if this 6-month trial period proves a success on the part of all concerned then it can be extended for a longer period of time.

On July 8, 1957, the State Department addressed a reply to my letter, signed by John S. Hoghland II, Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

It is worth recalling at this point that at the disarmament conference, now going on in London, the United States recently proposed the suspension of H-bomb tests for a period of 10 months. I prefer to believe that my letter to Secretary Dulles had something to do with the formulation of the proposal made by our delegation at the London conference.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason I believe it will be worth while to insert into the RECORD the text of the State Department's reply and my original letter.

The letters follow:

JUNE 13, 1957.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you not only in my capacity as a Member of Congress and as spokesman for the people of my district, but also as the father of five children. During these past few weeks I have given considerable thought, as millions of others have done, to the mortal perils of nuclear fallout—the perils for our own generation, but even more so for our children and grandchildren.

Scientists seem to be generally agreed that radioactive elements which were unleashed by A-bombs and H-bombs since 1945 are already damaging human health all over the world. There may be some debate as to the degree of such damage, but no one questions the danger involved. As more of these bombs are exploded the physical danger increases since the atmosphere becomes more polluted with radioactive material.

It has been suggested that the three major nations experimenting with nuclear weapons, the United States, Soviet Russia, and Great Britain, should agree to stop these experiments for the safety of the entire human race. Others have maintained that if we stop testing nuclear weapons, then we might face the danger of losing our position of leadership in this field and in due time the United States would assume an inferior position to Russia who would utilize it for its own selfish purposes.

If there is no imminent danger to the security of our Nation, I should like to propound this question: Could we continue our nuclear research without tests for a period of 6 months and yet not suffer to any material extent the loss of our present leadership position? Would we be in a vulnerable spot if we abstained from such tests for 6 months? If the answer to these questions is that we could continue our research without tests and yet not endanger our position, then I would like to suggest the following proposal:

Let the United States come forward with a flat declaration to the world that we have decided to make no further H-bomb tests for the next 6 months, regardless of what other countries do, because we earnestly believe it to be in the best interests of humanity and civilization. At the same time we will call on Russia and Britain to do likewise during the same trial period. In other words, declare a brief moratorium or trial period for the suspension of nuclear tests. I believe that public opinion throughout the world would force Russia and Great Britain to follow our example.

By our action, we would demonstrate to the world that the American people are taking the initiative to end the destruction of the human race. It would also show that the American people and their Government are sincerely and genuinely dedicated to world peace.

Naturally, if this 6-month trial period proves to be a successful experiment on the part of all nations concerned, it can then be extended for a longer period of time. In this way, perhaps, we can avert the threat to our own and to future generations. In this way, too, we can provide our children and grandchildren with an equal opportunity of coming into this world as normal human beings and with the hope of living a normal life free from the perils of radioactive fallout which are threatening them.

I believe, Mr. Secretary, that millions of people in this country and abroad would be most interested in your views regarding this proposal.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

JULY 8, 1957.

Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANFUSO: I refer to your letter of June 13, 1957, concerning fallout and a proposal that the United States halt nuclear tests for 6 months.

It is believed that a review of the testimony given at the recent fallout hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy would not bear out the statement, "scientists seem to be generally agreed that radioactive elements which were unleashed by A-bombs and H-bombs since 1945 are already damaging human health over all the world." The record will show that there is general agreement among scientists on the amount of fallout received and the amount of strontium 90 in the body. It is recognized that the extra radiation from the test fallout is a small fraction of the natural dosage individuals receive from their own bodies and surroundings and cosmic rays. Radiation from test fallout is very small when compared with the radiation produced by medical and dental X-rays to which many individuals are exposed. Dr. Libby, of the Atomic Energy Commission, you may recall, has pointed out that an individual may receive doses which far exceed those from fallout by living in a brick house or in the mountains.

The Committee on Genetic Effects of the NAS–NRC noted in its report released in June 1956 that "the fallout dose to date (and its continuing value if it is assumed that the weapons-testing program will not be substantially increased) is a small one as compared with the background radiation, or as compared with the average exposure in the United States to medical X-rays." The following excerpt is taken from its conclusions: "The fallout from weapons testing has, so far, led to considerably less irradiation of the population than have the medical uses—and has therefore been less detrimental. So long as the present level is not increased this will continue to be true; but there remains a proper concern to see to it that the fallout does not increase to more serious levels." At the recent fallout hearings Dr. H. Bentley Glass, who is a member of the committee, commented that no data have become available in the past year to warrant changing the earlier conclusion.

From the foregoing, one should not conclude that there is no risk to be taken in

connection with nuclear testing. There is a small risk; however, it is small in comparison with the ordinary risks that we take all the time. At the fallout hearings, Dr. Libby asked the following question, to which only an affirmative answer can be given: "Are we willing to take this very small and rigidly controlled risk, or would we prefer to run the risk of annihilation which might result if we surrendered the weapons which are so essential to our freedom and our actual survival?"

Regarding the advisability of a 6 months' unilateral suspension of nuclear testing, a detailed review of the entire disarmament problem (as it relates to nuclear weapons) has led to the conclusion that the heart of the nuclear threat is ever-increasing stockpiles of nuclear weapons. Accordingly, the United States has proposed that, under effective inspection, at a given date, all future production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes should cease and that transfers from past production to peaceful uses should begin. Within the framework of such an agreement it would be possible to undertake either a suspension or a complete elimination of all nuclear weapons testing. For these reasons, a unilateral move merely to suspend testing for a short period would appear not to attack the most important and potentially dangerous aspect of the nuclear threat. It might tend instead to give a misleading impression of progress toward a safeguarded disarmament agreement. It is the view of the Department of State that any agreement on testing should be a part of a first step in a general disarmament agreement that would include provisions for the cessation of production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. HOGHLAND II,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations
(For the Secretary of State).

Statement of Hon. Robert C. Byrd to the Subcommittee on Civil Service Retirement, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call to the attention of our colleagues the statement which I presented to the Subcommittee on Civil Service Retirement, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in connection with the hearings on the proposed legislation to increase the annuities of civil-service employees who retired prior to October 1, 1956. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT C. BYRD PRESENTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, JULY 3, 1957

Mr. Chairman and honorable members of the Subcommittee on Civil Service Retirement, I am grateful for this opportunity to present my views in support of H. R. 4 and related bills, which would increase the annuities of civil-service employees who retired prior to October 1, 1956. The bill which I introduced on January 10, 1957, is similar to H. R. 4.

The proposed legislation will benefit some 240,000 retirees and about 80,000 surviving widows and dependent children. These employees did not share in the increased benefits which the 84th Congress granted under Public Law 854 to persons retiring on or after its effective date, October 1, 1956. General revisions increasing benefits under the civil-service retirement system were enacted in 1926, 1930, 1942, and 1948, and in each of those enactments benefits were also provided for persons already retired. These increases were paid from the civil-service retirement fund and did not call for special appropriations.

It is true that in the first session of the 84th Congress a token increase was provided for civil-service annuitants, but it is also true that that token increase was far below the proportionate increase in the cost of living. And, of course, that token increase was prior to the legislation of 1956, enacted for the benefit of future retirees. This fact, as well as the further fact that the cost of living has increased each month since the enactment of 1956 legislation, plainly points up the unfortunate economic situation in which retirees now find themselves.

Prior to the adjournment of the 84th Congress, the Senate passed the bill, S. 3725, to provide the necessary increases for annuitants; however, due to the approaching adjournment, the House was not able to act on the subject.

It is my understanding that about 70 percent of the beneficiaries are men and the balance women. Some 50,000 of these former Federal employees are today receiving approximately $50 a month. Another 50,000 receive between $50 and $100 a month, and still another 50,000 receive between $100 and $150 a month. In other words, 75 percent of our civil-service retirees receive less than $150 a month. The plight of their survivors is even more distressing. The average survivorship annuity is $50 a month. Do not these stark facts, then, amply demonstrate that Congress has the duty and the obligation to provide equitable and necessary improvement in its program of retirement and survivor benefits for former Government employees and their survivors?

No one denies the gross inadequacy of retirement benefits in meeting the present high cost of living. The urgency for remedial action, however, was graphically revealed in a special report published in the August 3, 1956, issue of the U. S. News & World Report. That report showed that civil service retirees were down 13 percent from the 1939 standard of living. On the other hand, the report showed that 35 major groups, representing 95 percent of our population of workers, enjoyed increases above that 1939 standard, ranging from 4 to 107 percent.

Many of the individuals who will be benefited by the increases proposed in the legislation here under consideration are wholly dependent upon their annuities. The inflationary spiral has hit hard. The shrinkage in the purchasing power of the "retirement dollar" cannot be ignored either.

The average age of the annuitants to be benefited by this legislation is 67.7 years. This fact, too, points up the necessity for immediate and favorable consideration of the proposed legislation. We recognize that retirees are at a great disadvantage because the dollars which they paid into the retirement fund have greatly decreased in value. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to compensate for this loss in purchasing power and to provide some equity to these former Government workers.

The Congress has a direct responsibility to these former employees to see to it that their benefits have a sound relationship to the cost of living. Let us not overlook the real problems with which these retirees are faced. They are confronted with reduced income, reduced health, reduced living standards, and in many cases with increased medical expenses. Legislative action to assist these senior citizens is overdue.

In view of the above, I hope it will be possible for the subcommittee to give favorable consideration to the legislation here under consideration.

Hells Canyon, TVA, and Niagara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of my weekly newsletters which I send to the people of South Dakota. It deals with the subject of power at Hells Canyon, TVA, and Niagara.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELLS CANYON, TVA, AND NIAGARA

WASHINGTON, July 1, 1957.—It's time for plain speaking in South Dakota on power—public and private. Bills now pending in Congress point up the subject.

BILL NO. 1—HELLS CANYON

The Senate has passed a bill that would direct the Federal Government to build a high dam on the Snake River in Idaho

I voted against it. Why?

Because it will cost you your share of $500 million, possibly $600 million, plus damages to the private power company which has already spent about $20 million building some low dams under a license issued under President Roosevelt's 1936 Federal Power Act.

The issue was blurred by a tax amortization certificate that should not have been issued although the Idaho Power Co. was only getting what others have been getting since accelerated depreciation was resurrected with the Korean war. I did not like that—said so—introduced a resolution to stop it and stop all fast writeoffs.

Idaho Power then turned back its tax amortization certificate before the vote—but even if it had not, it does not make sense to make a $600 million mistake just because you've made an $18 million one.

Under either plan—there would be 750,000 kilowatts of firm power. A high dam might get 15,000 more. It might also get some dump power if you take water away from the upstream irrigators to fill a high dam. But I do not see using crop water to create dump power when the British are producing atomic power competitively.

So, I voted "No" which was to say, "Let the private company continue and let them put up the dough. We need lower, not higher, taxes."

BILL NO. 2—TVA

In the Senate Public Works Committee, I have helped to shape and report a bill that will let the Tennessee Valley Authority issue its own bonds up to $750 million to increase its facilities to meet growing power needs in its territory.

TVA is public power. My friends who think TVA is creeping socialism will probably themselves get the creeps on this one. And my REA friends who have been educated to think that one should be damned

politically and perhaps eternally if he did not vote for a publicly built Hells Canyon Dam may give me no credit for supporting TVA public power.

But you, my fairminded reader—don't let anybody poison your mind. FRANCIS CASE is neither under the control of the private power trust when it comes to Hells Canyon nor the Socialists when it comes to TVA. I simply think it makes sense to let the cost of these things fall somewhere else than on the backs of the taxpayer.

Since TVA, a proven operation, can sell bonds and finance its needed expansion, why do it by taxation or an increase in the national debt?

BILL NO. 3—NIAGARA

Another bill which I have helped to shape and report from Senate Public Works would let the State of New York, through its State Power Authority, develop the hydroelectric potential in the Niagara River. It will cost them $566 million.

Again, I'm in the middle. Between the folks who wanted the original Miller-Capehart bill that would turn Niagara's potential over to five private power companies and those who wanted the Lehman-Roosevelt bill to have Uncle Sam do it and pick up the check.

This will be public power—State public power—but the so-called public power people are unhappy because we did not tack on the full preference clause for public bodies and cooperatives.

I voted for modifying the preference clause because I think if New York State finances the job, the people of that State are entitled to at least 50 percent of the power in that State. And less than 5 percent of them are served by the so-called preference bodies.

Also, I respect the claim of New York to some of the power that will be produced from waters rising and dammed in their State. (You know I also think that for South Dakota, too.) New York, under Republican Gov. Charles Evans Hughes over 50 years ago asserted that claim and it has been continued through Democrat Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Republican Tom Dewey and present Democratic Gov. Averell Harriman. All have asserted the doctrine of our Western States that a State has certain rights in its waters.

So, I have never favored requiring New York to accept a Federal preference law that would require them to export their State-financed power from a State dam on waters rising partly at least in their State to cities and co-ops in Pennsylvania, Ohio and Indiana and deny it to the 95 percent of their own citizens who are served by private distributors.

Now if I seem to have written this a bit bluntly, it is because the time has come to call the turn on a tendency to damn or praise in terms of "public power" and "private power." We have both in the United States—and should.

Without the drive that men have when there is a prospect of making a profit from enterprise and hard work, this country would not do any better than Russia does with state enterprises exclusively; without the yardstick of TVA and the example of what people will do with abundant electric power when they can get it at rates they can afford, we would not be the country we are today.

Not in our generation would the farm homes of America be lighted and modernized as they are had there been no Rural Electrification Administration. It has meant more to improve rural living than any other farm legislation you can name.

And the simple existence of a TVA yardstick makes it safe to have private power development when private capital and enterprise are able and willing to undertake the venture.

In each of these three cases, FRANCIS CASE voted—not on a public-power or a private-power basis—but for the solution which appeared likely to get the job done with the most protection to the public purse and to you as a taxpayer. I would save on—

Hells Canyon—private power	$600,000,000
TVA—public power, private funds	750,000,000
Niagara—public power, New York funds	566,000,000
Total in 3 bills	1,916,000,000

That much power development for a growing United States without any demands on the Federal Treasury. Without any increase in your taxes.

That's the way I voted. But whether you will be saved that first $600 million depends on what happens to Hells Canyon in the House of Representatives or at the White House.

If you want to help pay for a high Hells Canyon Government-built dam, write your Congressman that you are willing to have the national debt increased or your income tax raised or your share of the tax cost hidden in the price of a new tractor, corn-picker, or TV set.

And if you'd like to have the full-preference clause tacked onto the Niagara bill, write your Congressman that you are willing to have the Niagara Dam built by the Federal Government. That's a sure way to pick up the tab New York State stands ready to accept.

And, if you want TVA to be public enterprise, pure and simple, tell us that you want all TVA growth financed by Federal appropriations instead of TVA bonds. That's a quick way to add $750 million to the Federal budget for the next 6 years.

Thanks for letting me report to you so frankly.

Pregnancies Grow in Washington Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the entire country has been following with interest the results of public-school integration in the District of Columbia. Because President Eisenhower had suggested that Washington's public school system should serve as a model of integration for other communities to follow, developments here have been carefully noted by the public.

Last fall, a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia conducted a thorough study of conditions in the newly integrated Washington schools, and the evidence presented to that subcommittee startled the entire Nation. I am quite sure that no fairminded person could close his eyes entirely to the disastrous effects that inevitably result from such wholesale integration if that person should take the time to read the transcript of hearings before that subcommittee.

In the current issue of U. S. News & World Report is to be found an enlightening article dealing with some of the problems brought about by integration of the District schools. The facts revealed in this article are shocking, to say the least, and should awaken even the most avid integrationists to the cold realities of life. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the aforementioned article:

PREGNANCIES GROW IN WASHINGTON SCHOOLS

Pregnancy and vandalism are being pictured officially as twin problems in schools of the Capital of the Nation.

The number of pregnancies has multiplied. In one big section of the city, the health-clinic center has recorded a rise of 1,000 percent in pregnancies among junior-high-school girls, between 1948–49 and the present. The rate of rise is reported by officials as most rapid in the years since 1954, when separate schools for Negroes and whites were ended.

At the same time, vandalism in schools is described as a problem of serious proportions. Representative EARL WILSON, Republican, of Indiana, told Congress of an investigation of vandalism made by him at an elementary school newly constructed at a cost of $677,400. The story told by Representative WILSON is given in this article as it was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

JUNIOR MOTHERS

It is the problem of pregnancy among school children that is attracting special attention at this time. The problem is described in detail by a report made to the Youth Council of the city's administrative body, the District of Columbia Commissioners. The report was prepared by Dr. John R. Pate from school records and is entitled "Junior Mothers." Dr. Pate is director of the District's Bureau of Disease Control.

What follows is from the text of the report on pregnancy among pupils in junior high schools of Washington:

"The members of the Commissioners Youth Council, area M, have expressed concern over the increasing rise of illegitimacy among the early teenage group.

"A rise of over 1,000 percent in the number of such instances in comparison with 1948–49 school-year figures to that of 1956–57 has come to the attention of the Southwest Health Center clinic.

"In 1948–49, there were only seven illegitimate pregnancies in this age group (junior high school) that came to our attention. It is not expected that this large an increase would hold true throughout the city; but, because the statistics have risen so dramatically over a period of years, it was felt that a further study of this problem would be timely in order to bring to the attention of all concerned the seriousness of the situation, for the problem generally has increased.

"Further, many of these children being born out of wedlock are dependent solely on public-assistance funds for their support. This economic burden merely adds another complication to the emotional and moral one in the community.

"Alarming increase

"During the current school year there has been an alarming increase in the number of pregnant girls in the 7th, 8th, and 9th grades of the junior high schools of the city of Washington coming to the Southwest Health Center to have completed and properly signed physicians' certificates of pupils' inability to attend school. This problem has been increasing over the last 2 to 3 years, more than was noted in several years prior to 1954. The fact is that, during the current school year, our records show an increase of approximately 1,000 percent in the number of illegitimate pregnancies as compared to the 1948–49 school year in this age group.

"The purpose of this report is not to cast reflection on any particular group, for this situation is not confined to any one segment of the population. But it might be said that it is most prevalent in the group coming from the lower socio-economic status.

"Of the 23 junior high schools in the city of Washington, we have records on children

from 13 schools reporting to this health center for confirmation of pregnancy in order to be excused from school.

"The statistics of the public schools, included in this report, cover a period of 8 months. In practically every school the report is not completely accurate, falling short of the total number of pregnancies.

"Even the official certification of live birth kept by the Division of Vital Statistics does not always give the true picture as to illegitimacy, for the certification record, which is a legal record, does not necessarily indicate whether the child is legitimate or illegitimate. This is only found in the supplementary section which is recorded in confidential files.

"The overall figures for the District of Columbia in the year 1954, insofar as were obtainable, show 3 percent of the births to whites were illegitimate and 26.3 percent to nonwhites. This figure included births in the District of Columbia of nonresidents also, which further distorts the actual picture.

"Broken homes

"The statistics included in this report * * * are the actual numbers which the public schools have on record. In analyzing the case records (of pregnancies) available at the Southwest Health Center, we find of the 78 on hand that 61 come from broken homes. Two of this number are second pregnancies. Both of these girls, 14 years of age, had their first child at 13. Only one of the 78 is an only child. For the most part, they come from large families with a number of children, live in crowded conditions, with a history of separation of parents, common-law fathers or multicommon-law fathers in one family. Some of these junior mothers come from families where this pattern has existed from 2 to 3 generations.

"Example: One patient who was first seen at this clinic in 1948 as a frail, undernourished female early in her first pregnancy now is the mother of six living children, with several men involved. She is now living alone with these small children and is being given support with funds provided by the Department of Welfare. She readily admits the more children she has, the more income she expects to receive from this source and does not anticipate changing her pattern of living. (The present ceiling is $200 per month.)

"This pattern is repeated time and time again.

"Another example, whose child is now 9 months old, left junior high school in the ninth grade. The father of the child is a 17-year-old male who has continued in school. He does well in schoolwork and in school activities. In fact, so well that he was considered for a citizenship award which was to have been presented at graduation in June 1957. But the feeling of the principal is that we should not extend such a distinction to an individual who breaks the moral code of our way of life.

"PARENTAL COMPLACENCY

"It is tragic indeed to see these children present themselves as late as the second trimester of pregnancy or even the third trimester without ever having any prenatal care whatsoever. In the majority of instances, the mother of the patient is seen. In discussing the seriousness of the situation, the parents' reaction mostly is one of complacency. However, it has been our feeling that the parents have already experienced an emotional shock, and, while at the clinic, they seem to attempt to excuse the situation on the basis of the fact that it could not be helped and now it is too late.

"However, in a number of instances, these junior mothers have returned to the clinic within 3 or 4 months with no signs of pregnancy. It can only be concluded that an abortion has occurred. This, too, presents a very serious and alarming medical problem. This situation has been increasing in the last few months.

"According to the records of the Bureau of Vital Statistics for the calendar year 1955, [in the District] there were only 86 illegitimate live births to girls under 15 years of age. Certainly, from all indications, an alarming percentage of births in the District of Columbia are illegitimate.

"In the early part of the 1956–57 school year one school in southwest [Washington] reported over half of the 240 children enrolled were illegitimate. In the past few months, in the course of the redevelopment project, many of these families have moved. However, there still remain 40 illegitimate children out of an enrollment of 210.

"Boasts and bad examples

"It has been observed that, when children in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades become premature mothers and then are required to return to a school setting, there has been a psychological change, as well as an enforced degree of maturity, which greatly, affects their ability to adjust to normal school activities. For the most part, these junior mothers simply do not do well in the classroom setting, and boast of their progeny. This creates curiosity and develops disrupting attitudes among other teen-agers.

"It may well be pointed out in one instance where a young teen-ager who had a baby kept showing snapshots of her offspring to her close personal friend, an eighth-grade pupil, until she created such a strong desire in this young girl, who had never been pregnant, that she determined to duplicate the feat of her friend. After having intercourse with a number of young males and not getting pregnant, she has developed a definite psychosis. This situation is serious and, in spite of all counseling, when these premature mothers return to school they boast of their child or children to their school friends. This serious reaction and conflict of standards is demoralizing to all of the children who are aware of the situation.

"Other cities, less trouble

"Inquiries were made of several cities regarding their problem and, with the exception of Baltimore, none of the other several cities seem to be having such a dramatic increase in illegitimacy as Washington. The city of Baltimore replied on December 6, 1956, which is quoted in part:

" 'There is a catastrophic lack of knowledge on illegitimacy, probably one of the most important problems in maternal health and subsequently in child health for cities like Washington and Baltimore.

" 'The number of illegitimate pregnancies cannot be established with finality. Of the total illegitimate babies, 50 percent occur among girls 18 years of age and lower.' In 1954 in the city of Baltimore, 36 percent of the total number of live births among the nonwhites were illegitimate. This was an increase of 6 percent over 1953 figures. There was no noticeable increase in illegitimacy among white teen-agers during this same period.

"In the city of New York there were 131 births to mothers under 15 years of age in 1955, and in 1956 there were 146 births to mothers in this age group. In 1956, 133 of these 146 were illegitimate or 91.1 percent. Of births occurring among young women between 16 and 19, there were a total of 12,074 live births. Of these, 2,687 could be identified as births out of wedlock or 22.3 percent. In New York City there has been a gradual increase in the overall proportion of illegitimate births since 1954. In that year it was 5.5 percent; 1955, 6.3 percent; 1956, 6.7 percent. These figures fall far short of those of the city of Washington, however.

"In the city of Philadelphia in 1955 there were only 98 illegitimate births to mothers under 15 years of age recorded; 7 white or 0.2 percent and 91 nonwhite or 0.7 percent.

"Special schools for mothers?

"It seems in a number of cases children have made an effort to become pregnant in order to stop school. This confession has been made by a number of pregnant girls. If the pregnancy occurs in the 13th or 14th year and they are forced to return to school against their desires, a number of these children have stated they have frankly made an effort to become pregnant again. It is felt that some form of training should be provided for these children regardless of their wishes, even if it requires the establishment of special schools for them. They should be taught how to care for their offspring and be given other forms of instruction which can be made of practical value.

"It seems that the problem of illegitimacy is more serious in Washington and Baltimore than in New York City, Philadelphia, or Richmond, Va. Since the increase in this city has been so noticeable during the 1956–57 school year as compared with several previous years, it seems that we are faced with an acute pattern that demands immediate and serious consideration.

"Within the last few days the junior-high-school nurses and counselors have again been contacted and the figures released from the Statistical Division of the Board of Education are lower than what now seems to be the facts. It can only be concluded that the problem is even more serious than our statistics reflect.

"Grade-school pregnancies

"Due to the regulation that children must attend school until they are 16 years of age, there are few figures for senior high school students since, by and large, these pupils have reached their 16th birthday and may discontinue school without having to have an official excuse. Consequently, no accurate figures are obtainable. This report is directed primarily toward junior high school students. However, there have been recorded in the elementary schools 8 pregnancies between September 10, 1956, and April 10, 1957. Seven of these girls were 11 years of age and 1 was 10 when she became pregnant.

"Further observation is that, in some schools the male teen-ager is responsible, while in others there seems to be a definite pattern of young adults, 20 to 30 years of age and even older, who are responsible. Some teen-age males have confessed to fathering 2 to 8 children.

"In several cases stepfathers and common-law husbands are responsible, and, in others, married men have been named as the responsible partner. Out of the total records of approximately 75 junior high school children seen, in only 2 cases has the girl become legally married to the father of her unborn child.

"To prevent calamity

"From the statistics included in this report and the accompanying narrative, it can be readily concluded that we are now faced with a serious juvenile problem which affects both girls and boys. The result is such an enormous moral and economic catastrophe that we cannot afford to look askance at the needs of these young people.

"Sex education in the home, the church, the schools, and other social agencies must be put into effect, as the atomic weapon for the prevention of illegitimacy, and sufficient social services instituted, as well as pupil guidance and every other means at our disposal put into full force to correct and prevent maladjustments which follow such experiences.

"Further, it is imperative that we join forces to circumvent this present calamity and that we instill in our teen-agers a proper code of conduct for school, church, home, and community.

"On the question of public assistance to these children, it might be assumed that it

will be the responsibility of the taxpayer for many years.

"Currently, in New York State the aid for children is catching up to the aid for the aging. It would be interesting in this city to learn the cost proportionately for financial aid to illegitimate children to that of the sick and aged.

"The proposals that have been submitted to Congress to help in the field of juvenile delinquency may have a great bearing on solving this problem when this measure is put into effect."

VANDALS AND HOODLUMS

Representative WILSON, who called attention to the school-vandalism problem, is a member of the House Appropriations Committee, which handles funds for the District. Congress provides about $5 million a year for new schools in the District, and it was abuse of one of these new schools that aroused Mr. WILSON.

The Wilson speech, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 1957:

"Two years ago—May 13, 1955, to be exact—the District of Columbia, with financial aid of the taxpayers all over the United States, completed construction of a $677,400 elementary school building at East Capitol and 55th Streets NE. The property, including a well-equipped playground, covers an entire block.

"Known as the Marion P. Shadd School, it has 26 classrooms, auditoriums, cafeterias, and all modern facilities. There are 32 teachers in addition to clerical and maintenance workers. Students total about 1,300, ranging from kindergarten through the sixth grade. It is an all-colored school in an all-colored community of modern, spacious apartments and homes.

"This is one of the finest school plants in Washington or anywhere else. It is an architectural and cultural landmark, an institution of which the residents of that Negro community should be very proud.

"A school ripped to bits

"However, this beautiful edifice is being destroyed—literally ripped to bits by vandals and hoodlums—while people of the neighborhood stand by in apparent disinterest. The Marion P. Shadd School is rapidly becoming a landmark of shame to the very people it is intended to serve.

"I inspected this school a few days ago, Mr. Chairman. I found hundreds of windowpanes broken. Mud and filth have been hurled against the building. Empty beer cans are scattered about the premises, piles of filth lie in the doorways, outdoor electrical equipment and entrance lights broken and destroyed. Three or four windows at the cafeteria end of the building have been boarded up by the school authorities because vandals break windowglass as fast as it is replaced. Obscene words and crude drawings cover portions of the neat little frame annex used for kindergarten pupils.

"This has been going on since the school was opened, I was informed by the distressed principal, Mrs. Lillian S. Glascoe, who has been a teacher in the District of Columbia schools for 34 years. The cost of replacing broken windows and repairing other damage to the building already has run into thousands of dollars, she told me. She says she has vainly sought cooperation of adults in the area.

"Lack of adult interest

"I am bringing this matter to the attention of this Chamber, Mr. Chairman, because Washington, as the seat of government, is a Congressional responsibility. Perhaps some of my colleagues may have suggestions as to how this shameful situation might be corrected.

"My own background as a teacher and a school administrator convinces me that this is a shocking example of the lack of adult interest in the schools established for their children. The Negro people who live in this area are allowing their magnificent institution to be turned into a landmark of shame to them.

"If we look more penetratingly into the problems of juvenile delinquency, we can see that parental delinquency and disinterest are prime factors."

A PROBLEM IN WASHINGTON'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Pregnancies among schoolgirls under 16, based on physicians' certificates received during the period September 10, 1956, to April 10, 1957:

Total pregnancies reported	190
Among Negro girls	178
Among white girls	12
In high schools	53
In junior high schools	129
In elementary school (including 1 girl 10 years old)	8

Federal Judiciary Will Provide Fair Administration of Civil Rights Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1957

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the civil-rights debate in the House of Representatives I took the occasion several times to oppose the jury trial amendment on the basis that the right of law-abiding citizens to vote without restraint is without doubt as important as the right of a wrongdoer to a jury trial. I also argued that since in most States the jury panels are selected from among the electors, the right to vote, therefore, is fundamental and essential to the conduct of fair jury trials. It is in the nature of things that some people who seek to interfere or restrain others in their right to vote must give up their right to jury trial under these circumstances so that others—equal Americans—may have the right to vote, from which all authority in our Government develops.

During the course of the argument on the floor, the opponents of the contempt provisions of the civil-rights legislation argued that the legislation constituted a mass indictment of the integrity of the entire southern populace of the country and that it would be irresponsible to charge that a whole people would be faithless to a solemn juror's oath.

I want to point out that the conduct of the contempt proceedings under the civil-rights bill as it passes the House of Representatives will in every case be conducted before distinguished jurists of the Federal bench who have lived and developed in their home communities. In every respect they are the products of the South and are familiar with its traditions and its culture.

Can those who oppose this legislation logically contend that these gentlemen, the judges of the Federal district courts in the southern districts, will ignore their obligation to comply with all corners of the law in passing upon the contempt charges which may be brought against their fellow men? Can it be contended that these are men who may be swayed by passion or prejudice or who will render arbitrary or indiscretionary judgments? I do not believe so.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting a list of the Federal judges who sit in the United States Federal district courts of the Southern States. By and large they are gentlemen who were born and raised in the communities in which they now act and pass judgment as judges of the Federal district court. They are products of the schools of the South. Some were members of Congress and have served with distinction throughout their entire careers. There is no reason for anyone to suspect that the civil-rights legislation will not be administered in keeping with the highest traditions of American jurisprudence.

ALABAMA

Daniel H. Thomas, judge; born, Prattville, Ala.; bachelor of laws, University of Alabama, 1928; admitted to Alabama bar, 1929; law practice, Mobile, 1929–51; assistant solicitor, 13th judicial circuit, Alabama, 1932–39; partner, Lyons, Thomas & Pipes, 1943–51; appointed United States district judge, southern district of Alabama, 1951. Hore: 13 Dogwood Circle, Spring Hill. Office: Federal Building, Mobile, Ala.

Seybourn Harris Lynne, judge; born, Decatur, Ala.; B. S., Alabama Polytechnic Institute, 1927; bachelor of laws, University of Alabama, 1930; admitted to Alabama bar, 1930; general practice of law, Decatur, Ala., 1930–34; judge, Morgan County Court, 1934–41; judge, Eighth Judicial Circuit of Alabama, 1941–42; judge, United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama since 1946. Home: 305 East Glenwood Drive, Birmingham. Office: Federal Building, Birmingham, Ala.

Harlan Hobart Grooms, judge; born, Jeffersonville, Ky.; bachelor of laws, University of Kentucky; admitted to bar, Kentucky and Alabama; practiced in Birmingham, Ala., 1926—; former member, Spain, Gillon, Grooms & Young; judge, United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, 1953—. Member, American, Alabama, Birmingham Bar Associations, Phi Alpha Delta, Omicron Delta Kappa, Scabbard and Blade, Pi Kappa Alpha. Home: 2624 Aberdeen Road. Office: Box 34, Birmingham, Ala.

Frank M. Johnson, Jr., judge; born, Haleyville, Ala.; graduate, Gulf Coast Military Academy, Gulfport, Miss., 1935, Massey Business College, Birmingham, 1937; bachelor of laws, University of Alabama, 1943, admitted to Alabama bar, 1943; private practice in Haleyville and Jasper since 1946; member of firm; Curtis, Maddox & Johnson, 1946–53; United States attorney, northern district of Alabama since 1953. Served as private to captain, Infantry, United States Army, 1943–46. Decorated, Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster; Bronze Star. Home: 1100 Ninth Avenue, Jasper, Ala. Office: Federal Building, Birmingham, Ala.

ARKANSAS

Harry J. Lemley, judge; born Upperville, Va., student University of Virginia, 1901–03; bachelor of laws, Washington and Lee University, 1910, doctor of laws, University of Arkansas. Admitted to Arkansas bar, 1912, practiced at Hope, Ark., 1912–39; United States district judge, eastern and western districts, Arkansas, since 1939. Member Phi Delta Theta, Phi Delta Phi. Author and coauthor of papers on archeology of Arkansas. Home, Hope, Ark. Address, Texarkana, Ark.

John Elvis Miller, judge; born near Aid, Mo., student Southeast Missouri State Teachers College, Cape Girardeau, and Valparaiso

(Indiana University, bachelor of laws, University of Kentucky, 1912). In practice of law, Searcy, Ark., since 1912, member Miller & Yingling; prosecuting attorney, first judicial circuit, Arkansas, 1919–22; director Bank of Searcy. Member 72d to 75th Congresses (1931–39), 2d Arkansas District; resigned on election as United States Senator to fill vacancy caused by death of Joseph T. Robinson for term ending 1943; resigned from United States Senate (April 1, 1941) to become judge of the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas. Member Arkansas Bar Association. Home, Fort Smith, Ark.

FLORIDA

Dozier A. DeVane, judge; born near Lakeland, Fla., student Florida State College, Tallahassee, 1904–05; bachelor of laws, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., 1908. Admitted to Florida bar 1908; practiced in Tampa, 1908–18; county attorney Hillsboro County, 1913–14; counsel to Florida Railroad Commission, 1918–20; rate attorney American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 1920–22; general counsel Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., and associated companies, 1922–30; practiced law in District of Columbia 1930–33; solicitor, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., 1933–38; reentered private practice Ordando, Fla., 1938; member DeVane, Andrews & Patterson; appointed United States district judge, northern and southern districts of Florida, 1943, northern district, 1947. Member Kappa Sigma O. D. K. Phi Beta Kappa. Home, Old St. Augustine Road; office, Federal Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

George W. Whitehurst, judge; born Wauchuta, Fla. Student, Stetson University; bachelor of laws, University of Florida; admitted to Florida bar; Florida State circuit judge; now United States district judge, Miami. Home: 301 Valencia Way, Fort Myers, Fla.; office: Post Office Box 1070, Miami, Fla.

William J. Barker, judge; born Marietta, Ga., bachelor of laws with highest honors, University of Georgia, 1916. Admitted to Florida bar, 1916, and began practice in Jacksonville; judge, circuit court of State of Florida, 1925–40; United States district judge, southern district of Florida, since 1940. Member, American and Florida Bar Associations. Home: 3305 Lykes Avenue; office: Federal Building, Tampa, Fla.

Bryan Simpson, judge; born Kissimmee, Fla., bachelor of laws, University of Florida, 1926. Admitted to Florida bar, 1926, and practiced in Jacksonville, 1926–39; assistant States attorney, fourth Florida circuit, 1933–37, judge, criminal court of record, Duval County, Fla., 1939–46; circuit judge fourth Florida circuit, 1946–50; United States district judge, southern district, Florida, 1950. Trustee Bolles School, Jacksonville; member State board Children's Home Society, Florida. Served as first lieutenant United States Army, 1943–45, 12 months ETO. Member American, Jacksonville Bar Associations, Florida bar.

Emett Clay Choate, United States judge; born Columbus, Ohio; bachelor of laws, University of Indiana, 1914; admitted to Indiana bar and Oklahoma bar, 1914, New York bar, 1922, Florida bar, 1925; practiced in Oklahoma City, 1917–21, New York City, 1922–25, Miami, 1925–54; United States judge southern district, Florida, 1954. Member Housing Authority, City of Miami, 1952; member national board, field advisers, Small Business Administration, 1954. Delegate Representative National Convention, 1952. Served as first lieutenant, Oklahoma Infantry, 1914–16; major, Field Artillery, United States Army, 1917–18. Member American Automobile Association, American, Florida, Dade County Bar Associations, Phi Delta Phi. Clubs: Kiwanis (Miami); home: 3306 Crystal, Miami, Fla.

GEORGIA

Frank Arthur Hooper, Federal judge; born in Americus, Ga.; student, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta Law School, 1936, LL. M., 1937; secretary to judge, Georgia Court of Appeals, 1917, private practice, Atlanta, 1919–43; judge, Georgia Court of Appeals, 1933; instructor, Atlanta Law School, 1934–43; assistant city attorney, Atlanta, 1940–43; judge, superior court, Atlanta Judicial Circuit, 1943–49; United States district judge, Northern District of Georgia, 1949. Member, Georgia House of Representatives, 1925–28. Served as ensign, USNRF, 1919.

William B. Sloan, judge; born in Gainesville, Ga.; admitted to Georgia Bar, 1915; Representative, Georgia State General Assembly, 1927–31; assistant attorney general, Georgia, 1932; judge, city court, Hall County, Georgia, 1934–45; judge, superior courts, Northeast Judicial Circuit, Georgia, 1945–48; United States district court, Northern District, Georgia, since 1951. Member, American, Georgia State Bar Associations, American Judicature Society. Home: 1188 Cherokee Road. Office: Federal Building, Gainesville, Ga.

Thomas Hoyt Davis, United States district judge; born in Braselton, Ga.; bachelor of arts, Mercer University; admitted to Georgia Bar, 1916; in general practice, 1916–26; solicitor general, Cordele judicial circuit, Georgia, 1927–33; United States attorney, middle district, Georgia, 1933–45; United States district judge, middle district, Georgia, 1945. Member, Georgia Bar Association, Cordele Circuit Bar Association. Home: Vienna, Ga.

William Augustus Bootle, judge; born in Colleton County, S. C.; Mercer University, 1924, LL. B., 1925; admitted to Georgia Bar, 1925, since practiced at Macon; member, Carlisle & Bootle, 1933–54; United States district attorney, Middle Georgia District, 1929–33; acting dean, Mercer University Law School, 1933–37; part-time professor of law, 1926–37; judge, United States district court, Middle District, Georgia, 1954. Trustee, Mercer University, chairman, executive committee board, 1941–46, 1948–53. Member, Phi Delta Theta. Club: Civitan, president, 1936). Home: 196 Buckingham Place. Office: Post office, Macon, Ga.

Frank M. Scarlett, Federal judge; born in Brunswick, Ga.; 1898–08, Gordon College, Barnesville, Ga., 1908–10; bachelor of laws, University of Georgia, 1913; admitted to bar of Georgia, 1913; practiced law in Brunswick under name of Courtland Symmes & Scarlett, 1913–15; private practice, 1915–29; appointed solicitor of city court of Brunswick, 1919–29; entered partnership under name of Reese, Scarlett, Bennett & Highsmith, 1929–37, with Reese, Scarlett, Bennett & Gilbert, 1937–46; United States district judge since February 14, 1946; president, Brunswick Chamber of Commerce, 1936–38. Home: 902 Wright Square. Office: Federal Building, Brunswick, Ga.

LOUISIANA

Herbert William Christenberry, judge; born New Orleans, La. Student Soule College, New Orleans; bachelor of laws, Loyola University 1924, also student, New York University, 1927; private practice, 1924–33; assistant attorney, Board of Commissioners of Port New Orleans, 1933–35; deputy commissioner, Louisiana Debt Moratorium Commission, 1935; assistant district attorney, Parish of Orleans, 1935–57; assistant United States attorney, Eastern District of Louisiana, 1937–42, United States attorney, 1942–47; United States district judge since 1947; instructor, Loyola University of the South, School of Law. Member, Federal Bar Association, Louisiana State Bar Association, New Orleans Bar Association; home, 4300 St. Ann St.; office: 600 Camp Street, New Orleans.

James S. Wright, district judge; born New Orleans. Bachelor of philosophy, Loyola University, 1931. Bachelor of laws, 1934; high school teacher, 1931–35; lecturer, English history, Loyola University, 1936–37; assistant United States attorney, New Orleans, 1937–46; practice of law, Ingoldsby, Coles & Wright, Washington, 1946–48; United States attorney, Eastern District, Louisiana, 1948–49. Served as lieutenant commander, United States Coast Guard, 1942–46. Observer, United States State Department of International Fisheries Conference, London, 1943. Member, Louisiana State Bar Association (board of governors), Federal Bar Association (president, New Orleans chapter). District of Columbia Bar Association, New Orleans Bar Association, Alpha Delta Gamma (national president). Clubs: Army-Navy (New Orleans); Army-Navy Country (Washington); Home: 35 Newcomb Boulevard, New Orleans, 18; office: Post Office Building, New Orleans.

Ben C. Dawkins, Jr., judge; born Monroe, La., bachelor of arts, Tulane University, 1932; bachelor of laws, Louisiana State University, 1934; admitted to Louisiana bar, 1934, practiced in Monroe, 1934–35, Shreveport, 1935–53; member, firm, Blanchard, Goldstein, Walker & O'Quin, 1935–53; United States district judge, Western District, Louisiana since 1953. President, Shreveport Recreation Council, 1941; director Children's Service Bureau, 1947–51, Child Guidance Clinic, 1952. Member school board, Caddo Parish School, 1949–53, president, 1950–52. Served as lieutenant commander, air navigator, United States Naval Reserve, 1942–45. Member, America, Louisiana State (board of governors, 1950–52) Shreveport (vice president, 1941–42, secretary-treasurer, 1947–48; president, 1949–50), bar associations, Shreveport Chamber of Commerce (director 1949–52), Junior Chamber of Commerce (director 1941–42); American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars (post commander, 1946–47, judge advocate, Louisiana department, 1947–48), Delta Kappa Epsilon, Phi Delta Phi, Omicron Delta Kappa; Club: Shreveport Exchange (president, 1951). Home: 4054 Baltimore Street; office: Federal Building, Shreveport, La.

Edwin Ford Hunter, Jr., United States judge, born Alexandria, La. Student, Louisiana State University, 1930–33; bachelor of laws, George Washington University, 1938; admitted to Louisiana bar, 1938, member, Smith Hunter, Risinger & Shuey, Shreveport, 1940–53, member, Louisiana State Legislature, 1948–52; executive counsel, Governor, Louisiana, 1952; member, Louisiana State Mineral Board, 1952. Served as lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve, 1942–45, on U. S. S. *Saratoga*. Member American Bar Association (Louisiana State chairman, junior bar section, 1945), American Legion (post commander, 1945, judge advocate, Department Louisiana, 1948), Sigma Chi. Home: 1027 Ninth Street; office: Post Office Box 1339, Lake Charles, La.

MISSISSIPPI

Sidney Carr Mize, judge; born, Scott County, Miss.; bachelor or arts, Mississippi College, Clinton, 1908; bachelor of laws, University of Mississippi, 1911; admitted to Mississippi bar, 1911, forming law partnership with his brother, Joe H. Mize, to 1926; then firm changed to Mize, Thompson & Mize; served as special district attorney, special county judge, special chancery judge; United States judge for southern district of Mississippi since 1937. Member, Democratic State Executive Committee, 1931–37. Trustee, Gulfport municipal schools, 1930–38. Member, American, Mississippi State, and Harrison County bar associations; Phi Kappa Psi, Phi Delta Phi. Address: Gulfport, Miss.

NORTH CAROLINA

Wilson Warlick, judge; born, Newton, N. C.; bachelor of science, Catawba College; 1910 doctor of laws (honorary) 1936; bachelor of laws, University of North Carolina, 1913; admitted to North Carolina bar 1913, practiced law, Newton, N. C., 1913–30; judge, su-

perior court, 16th judicial district, 1930–49; United States district judge, western district, North Carolina, since 1949. Chairman, North Carolina Probation Commission since 1937. Served as lieutenant, G–2, American Expeditionary Forces, Adjutant General Department, World War I; member of S. A. R. American Legion, 40 et 8, Alpha Tau Omega. Office: Federal Building, Statesville, N. C.

Donnell Gilliam, judge; born, Tarboro, N. C.; student, University of North Carolina, 1905–10; admitted to North Carolina Bar, 1910; member, firm Gilliam & Bond, Tarboro, 1923–45; State district solicitor, 1923–45; United States district judge, eastern district of North Carolina since May 30, 1945. Chairman, Edgecombe County Democratic Executive Committee, 1910–45. Member, Delta Kappa Epsilon. Home: 302 Church St., Tarboro, N. C.

OKLAHOMA

Royce E. Savage, judge; born, Blance, Okla.; bachelor of arts, University of Oklahoma, 1925, bachelor of laws, 1927; assistant insurance commissioner, 1927–29; practiced law as member firm Monnet & Savage, Tulsa, 1929–38; Cantrell, Savage & McCloud, Oklahoma City, 1938–40; appointed United States district judge for northern district of Oklahoma, 1940. Member of Phi Delta Theta and Phi Delta Phi. Home: 2135 East 25th Street; office: Federal Building, Tulsa.

William R. Wallace, judge; born, Troy, Tex.; student, Indianola College (now University of Tulsa), 1901–05; University of Oklahoma, 1909–10; doctor of laws, Oklahoma Baptist University, 1947; admitted to Oklahoma Bar, 1910, practiced in Pauls Valley, Okla., 1910–25; county judge, Garvin County, 1913–17; attorney, Magnolia Petroleum Co. and Lone Star Gas Co., 1925–50; United States district judge for the northern, eastern, and western districts of Oklahoma since 1950. Served as member of Oklahoma State Legislature, 1909–23. Chairman of Oklahoma Public Welfare Commission, 1939–42; board of regents, University of Oklahoma, 1944–48; member of American and Oklahoma Bar Associations, Kappa Sigma. Clubs: Rotary, Men's Dinner. Home: 2419 North Harvey, Oklahoma City; office: Federal Building, Oklahoma City.

Eugene Rice, judge; born, Union City, Tenn., bachelor of science, Hall-Moody College, Martin, Tenn., 1910; bachelor of laws, Valparaiso University, 1917; taught in rural schools of Tennessee, 1910–13; admitted to Oklahoma bar, 1920, and practiced in Oklahoma; State district judge, 1930–37; former member of court of tax review, Oklahoma; appointed United States district judge, eastern district, Oklahoma, 1937. Served with United States Army and AEF, 1917–19. Member of American Bar Association, Oklahoma State Bar Association; honorary member of Phi Delta Phi. Home: 1521 Boston Street; office: Federal Building, Muskogee, Okla.

Stephen S. Chandler, judge; born, Blount County, Tenn.; student of University of Tennessee, 1917–18; bachelor of laws, University of Kansas, 1922; private law practice in Oklahome City, 1922–43; appointed United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, 1943. Member of Sigma Alpha Epsilon and Phi Delta Phi. Clubs: Oklahoma City Golf, Beacon, and Rotary.

Ross Rizley, judge; born, Beaver, Okla.; bachelor of laws, University of Kansas City, 1915; admitted to Okhaloma bar, 1915; actively practicing law since 1915; county attorney, Beaver County, Okla., 1919–20; State senator, first Oklahoma district, 1931–35; Member, 77th-80th Congresses (1941–49), 8th Oklahoma District; Solicitor, Post Office Department, March to December 1953; Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, 1953–54; Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, 1955; director, City National Bank, Guymon; member, Guymon Chamber of Commerce (former president, director). Member, Oklahoma State Bar and American Bar Associations; address: Guymon, Okla.; office: Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

SOUTH CAROLINA

George B. Timmerman, judge; born, Edgefield County, S. C.; graduate, Patrick Military Institute, 1900; bachelor of laws, South Carolina College (now University of South Carolina) 1902; doctor of laws (honorary) 1952; general practice of law, 1902–42; appointed United States district judge for the eastern and western district of South Carolina, 1942; captain, South Carolina Militia, aide on brigade staff, 1905; solicitor, 5th judicial circuit, 1905–08; 11th judicial circuit, 1908–20; member, State of South Carolina Highway Commission, 1931–39, chairman, 1936–39; chairman, Lexington County (S. C.) Democratic Committee, 1914–16; Democratic State executive committeman, 1930–32, 1938–42; president, Democratic State convention, 1932; chairman, Ridge District Boy Scouts of America, 1940–43; vice president, central council, 1942–44; chairman, Batesburg-Leesville Park Commission, 1941–46; trustee, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C., 1941–47. Member, South Carolina and American Bar Associations, Phi Kappa Sigma, Omicron Delta Kappa. Home: Rutland Street, Batesburg, S. C.; office: United States Courthouse, Columbia, S. C.

Ashton H. Williams, judge; born, Lake City, S. C.; bachelor of arts, University of South Carolina, 1912; graduate law school; Georgetown University, 1915; admitted to South Carolina bar, 1914; since, practiced in South Carolina; member, Lake City Council, 1916–17; South Carolina State House of Representatives, 1921–22; senator, Florence County, 1923–26; member, Democratic National Executive Committee, South Carolina, 1948–49. Author (while in senate): Pay-as-You-Go Road Act, 1923; Coastal Highway Act; first act to tax gasoline for good roads; office, United States Courthouse, Charleston, S. C.

Charles C. Wyche, judge; born, Prosperity, S. C.; bachelor of science, The Citadel, Charleston, 1906; doctor of laws, 1952; Georgetown University, 1908–9; admitted to South Carolina bar in 1909, and practiced at Spartanburg; member, South Carolina House of Representatives, 1913–14; city attorney, Spartanburg County, 1919–33; United States district attorney, western district of South Carolina, 1933–37; appointed United States district judge western district of South Carolina, January 30, 1937; circuit judge, court common pleas, by special appointment, 1924; court of general sessions, 1924; associate justice, Supreme Court of South Carolina, by special appointment, 1929. Served in World War I, advancing from first lieutenant to major with AEF and Army of Occupation; member American and South Carolina State (president, 1931–32), Spartanburg County Bar Associations; American Law Institute; home: 268 Mills Avenue; office: Federal Building, Spartanburg, S. C.

TENNESSEE

William E. Miller, judge; born Johnson City, Tenn., bachelor of arts, University of Tennessee, 1930; bachelor of laws, Yale, 1933; admitted to Tennessee bar 1933; member, Cox, Epps, Miller & Weller, Johnson City, 1933–55; chancellor, first chancery division, Tennessee, 1939; United States district judge, middle district, Tennessee, 1955—. Member, Tri-Cities Airport Commission. Presidential elector, 1940; member, Constitutional Convention of Tennessee, 1953. Chairman, Washington County Chapter, American Red Cross, 1938–40; board of visitors, Emory and Henry College. Served as major, United States Air Force, World War II. Member, Johnson City Chamber of Commerce, American, Tennessee, Washington County (past president) bar associations; American Counsel Association; American Judicature Society; American Legion; Sigma Alpha Epsilon. Clubs: Executives, Kiwanis, Hurstleigh, Johnson City (Johnson City, Tenn.). Home: 228 Vaughan's Gap Road, Nashville. Office: Federal Building, Nashville.

Marion S. Boyd, judge; born 1900; graduate, University of Tennessee, 1921; judge, United States district court, western district of Tennessee since 1940. Office: Federal Building, Memphis, Tenn.

Leslie Rogers Darr, judge; born Jasper, Tenn.; student, Pryor Institute, Jasper, 1904–08; bachelor of laws, Cumberland University, 1909; admitted to Tennesseee bar, 1910; practiced law at Jasper, Tenn., 1910–26; judge, 18th circuit of Tennessee, 1926–39; United States district judge, eastern and middle districts of Tennessee since 1939. Home: 1506 Riverview Road, Chattanooga, Tenn.

TEXAS

Thomas W. Davidson, judge; born Harrison County, Tex.; special courses study, Columbia and University of Chicago; studied law privately; admitted to Texas bar, 1903; practiced in Marshall; city attorney, 1907; State senator, 1921; Lieutenant Governor of Texas, 1923; United States district judge, northern district of Texas, since February 1936. Member, Democratic National Convention, 1912–32. Member American, Texas (president, 1927), and Dallas Bar Associations; president, Harrison County Bar Association, 1916. Home: Maple Terrace, Maple Avenue. Office: Post Office Box 286, Dallas 1, Tex.

Joseph B. Dooley, Federal judge; born San Angelo, Tex.; practiced law, Amarillo, Tex., 1911–47; president, State Bar of Texas, 1944–45; United States district judge for northern district of Texas, 1957; member advisory committee, Supreme Court of Texas, 1940; member, American Bar Association, State Bar of Texas. Home: 3011 Hughes Street. Office: Federal Court Building, Amarillo, Tex.

Allen B. Hannay, judge; born Hempstead, Tex.; student Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, 1907–9; bachelor of laws, University of Texas, 1913; admitted to Texas bar, June 10, 1913; practiced law in Hempstead and Houston, Tex., 1913–30; Walter County, judge, 1915–17; appointed district judge, 113th district of Texas, March 30, 1930; United States district judge since 1942; member, committee on judicial statistics, United States courts; member, Texas Bar Association. Home: 4001 Ella Lee Lane. Address: 330 Post Office Building, Houston.

James V. Allred, judge; born Bowie, Tex.; admitted to Texas bar, 1921; bachelor of laws, Cumberland University, 1921, began practice at Wichita Falls; district attorney, same 1923–25; attorney general of Texas, two terms, 1931–35; Governor, State of Texas, 1935–39; United States district judge; southern district of Texas, 1939–42; engaged in practice of law; United States district judge, southern district of Texas, since 1951. Home: 4720 Bellaire. Office: Electric Building, Houston, Tex.

Ben C. Connally, judge; born Marlin, Tex.; bachelor of arts, University of Texas, 1930, bachelor of laws, 1933; master of laws, Harvard, 1934; admitted to bar, Texas 1933; practiced as member firm Sewell, Taylor, Morris & Connally, Houston, 1934–42; Butler & Binion, 1945–49; United States district judge, southern district of Texas, since 1949. Member American, Texas & Houston bar associations, American Legion, Houston Chamber of Commerce; Home: 244 Hedwig Road; Office: 416 Post Office Building, Houston.

Joe W. Sheehy, judge; born Saratogo, Tex.; student University of Texas, 1927–29; bachelor of laws, Baylor University, Waco, Tex., 1934; admitted to Texas bar, 1934, and since practiced in Tyler as member firm of Ramey, Calhoun, Marsh, Brelsford & Sheehy; assistant general Texas 1934; United States district judge for eastern district of Texas, Tyler, since 1951. Member American, Texas, and Smith County (pres. 1942) bar associations.

Home: 2312 S. Chilton Street; Office: Federal Building, Tyler, Tex.

Ben H. Rice, Jr., judge; born Marlin, Tex.; bachelor of laws, University of Texas, 1913; master of laws, 1914; admitted to Texas Bar, 1913; assistant county attorney, Falls County, Tex., 3 years; city attorney, Marlin, 9 years; elected chief justice 10th Court of Civil Appeals, 1940; Federal judge western district of Texas since 1950. Address: Federal Court House, San Antonio.

Robert E. Thomason, judge; born Shelbyville, Tenn.; B. S., Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex., 1898; bachelor of laws, University of Texas, 1900; began practice of law, Gainesville, Tex., 1900; district attorney, Gainesville, 1902–6; practiced at El Paso, Tex.; since 1912; member Texas House of Representatives, 1917–21; speaker of house, 1920–21; mayor of El Paso, 1927–31; member 72d to 80th Congress, 1931–47, 16th Texas district; United States district judge, western district, Texas. Address: 1918 North Stanton Street; Office: Federal Building, El Paso, Tex.

Joe McDonald Ingraham, judge; born Pawnee County, Okla. Admitted to Oklahoma bar, 1927, District of Columbia bar, 1927, Texas bar, 1928; practiced in Stroud, Okla., 1927–28, Fort Worth, 1928–35; Houston, 1935–54; served as member United States House of Representatives, 1934–48; associate justice, Texas Supreme Court, 1936, 1938, 1940; judge, United States District Court, Southern District, Texas, 1954. Secretary Tarrant Co., representative executive committee, 1930–35, chairman, Harris Co., 1946–53, member Texas State executive commission, 1952—; presidential elector, 1932, alternate delegate national convention, 1940, delegate, 1948, 1952. Served as lieutenant colonel, United States Army Air Force, 1942–46. Member American Houston Bar Association, Texas State bar, S. A. R. (president, Texas, 1937–38.) American Legion. Club: Army and Navy Association (president, 1950). Home: 2341 Sunset Boulevard, Houston 5; Office: Post Office Building, Houston 2.

VIRGINIA

John Paul, judge; born Harrisonburg, Va.; graduate, Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, 1903; bachelor of laws, University of Virginia, 1906; admitted to Virginia bar, 1906, and practiced at Harrisonburg; member, Virginia State Senate, 1912–16, 1919–22; member, 67th Congress (1921–23), 7th Virginia District; special assistant to United States Attorney General, 1924–25; United States district attorney, western Virginia district, 1929–31. United States district judge since January 1932. Served as captain, Field Artillery, United States Army, 1917–19 with American Expeditionary Forces, May 1918–19. Member, Raven Society (University of Virginia), Kappa Alpha, Phi Delta Phi, Phi Beta Kappa. Home: R. F. D., Dayton, Va. Address: Federal Building, Harrisonburg, Va.

Alfred Dickinson Barksdale, judge; born Halifax, Va., educated Cluster Springs Academy, 1907–08; Virginia Military Institute, 1908–11, bachelor of science; University of Virginia, 1912–15, bachelor of laws; admitted to Virginia bar, August 13, 1915, and began practice in Lynchburg; judge, Sixth Judicial Circuit of Virginia, 1938–40; judge, United States District Court, Western District of Virginia, since January 1940. Member, Virginia Senate, 1924, 1926, 1927. Served as captain, 116th Infantry, United States Army with American Expeditionary Forces, World War I. Decorated Distinguished Service Cross, Chevalier Legion of Honor, Croix de Guerre. Trustee, Hollins College. Member, board of visitors, University of Virginia; member Lynchburg (Va.), State and American bar associations; Kappa Alpha, Phi Delta Phi, Phi Beta Kappa. Home: 2001 Link Road; Office: Post Office Box 877, Lynchburg, Va.

Albert B. Bryan, judge; born Alexandria, Va., bachelor of laws, University of Virginia, 1921; admitted to Virginia bar, 1921; practiced in Alexandria, 1921–47; city attorney, Alexandria, 1926–28; commonwealth's attorney, 1928–47; United States district judge, eastern district of Virginia, 1947—. Member, State board of corrections, Virginia, 1943–45; member, board of law examiners, 1944–47; member American, Virginia bar associations; American Law Institute; Phi Kappa Sigma, Phi Delta Phi. Home: 2826 King Street, Alexandria, Va. Office: United States Courthouse, Alexandria; also Norfolk, Va.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 1957

(Legislative day of Monday, July 8, 1957)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful Father, whose power and whose love eternally work together for the protection and enrichment of Thy children, give us grace this day to live by faith in things unseen—the faith that Thou dost rule the world in truth and righteousness, the faith in the final coronation of Thy loving purposes for mankind, unfolding even in the social convulsions of these tense times, the faith that will make us calm and courageous in the face of risks and threats and dangers which will meet us in the faithful doing of our duty. Rid us, we beseech Thee, of all vain anxieties and paralyzing fears, and give us cheerful and buoyant spirits and abiding peace in seeking and following Thy will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 9, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of David W. Edeen, to be postmaster at American Lake, Wash., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6814. An act to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; and

H. R. 8594. An act to authorize the Honorable ALBERT P. MORANO, Member of Congress, to accept and wear the award of the Cross of Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix conferred upon him by His Majesty the King of the Hellenes.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have been following as closely as any other Member of the Senate the debate which has been taking place on the motion made by the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. It seems to me that the discussion thus far has produced two things:

First, a climate of reason within which the Senate can reach a meaningful conclusion.

Second, the need for some technical studies which can be used as a framework of reference.

In this instance, the Senate is operating without the benefit of a committee report, our normal source for reference material. Therefore, I am having some intensive studies made by some of the members of my staff, on some of the issues which have been raised by the discussions in the Senate.

I think we need basic information on the cases which have been decided under section 1985 of title 42 of the United States Code. That has reference, Mr. President, to part III of the bill.

I think we need basic information on the extent to which court decisions have already made law in the field of civil rights.

I wish to commend the Members of the Senate for the very high level of discussion which has taken place up to now. I appeal to them to continue in a spirit of reason and persuasion. I have no doubt that when action on this subject is completed, every citizen will have a right to be proud of the conduct of this great body.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISIT TO THE SENATE ON JULY 11 BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF PAKISTAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement in connection with the visit to the United States of the Prime Minister of Pakistan. By agreement with the minority leader and the Presiding Officer, at 3 o'clock on tomorrow, July 11, the Prime Minister will visit the Senate, and will be requested to make an address to the Senate at that time.

In this connection, Mr. President, I wish to say that the visit of Pakistan's Prime Minister, Husseyn S. Suhrawardy, to this country is a welcome occasion.

Pakistan is a nation which has a record of remarkable achievement under great difficulties. Its struggles to main-